

Atty. Dkt. No. 074022-3302

REMARKS

Claims 59, 60 and 61 have been amended and claim 62 has been newly added. No amendments have been made to obviate prior art. Support for the amendments and the new claim is found generally. Accordingly, the amendments and the new claim raise no issue of new matter.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Marschel for the courtesies extended in the telephonic interview of November 30, 2004 where issues raised by the Examiner in the Advisory Action mailed April 7, 2004 were discussed. The amendments and remarks herein reflect the discussion of the April 11, 2005 interview, and the conclusion that such submission may place the case in condition for allowance.

Applicants wish to clarify on the record an apparent misunderstanding about a previous telephonic interview held on January 5, 2005, which was referenced in an Amendment After Final Rejection filed by the Applicants on January 5, 2005. Specifically, a statement at page 2 of the Advisory Action mailed April 7, 2005, suggests that the January 5, 2005 interview had not taken place. This conclusion was reached by Examiner Marschel because he did not recollect the meeting and because there was no Examiner Interview Summary Record in the USPTO case file. However, during the interview of April 11, 2005, Examiner Marschel indicated that his Examiner interview summary of January 5, 2005 had apparently reached the file after he completed the Advisory Action. Examiner Marschel stated in the interview of April 11, 2005 that he now agrees with the Applicants that the interview of January 5, 2005 had indeed taken place.

INT SUM OK
AM 5-26-05

Atty. Dkt. No. 074022-3302

REMARKS

Claims 59, 60 and 61 have been amended. No amendments have been made to obviate prior art or to overcome any rejections. Support for the amendments is found generally. Accordingly, the amendments and the new claims raise no issue of new matter.

Interview Summary

The undersigned conducted a telephonic interview with Examiner Marschel on January 5, 2005 to discuss the remaining issues in the case. Agreement was reached on all issues as reflected by the amendments and remarks herein. This Amendment After Final Rejection was filed at the suggestion of the Examiner.

Improper Multiple Dependence

The Examiner has objected to claim 61 as being a multiple dependent claim that depends from other multiple dependent claims. Applicants have amended claim 61 to refer only to non-multiple dependent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

New Matter Rejection

The Examiner asserts that the language in claims 56, 58 and 60 referring to the absence of interconnections between channels is new matter because the specification allegedly only describes this feature in conjunction with achieving laminar flow character. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is without basis because there is no requirement for a functional result to be recited with a clear negative limitation on structure (i.e. no interconnections). Furthermore, the Examiner's attention is directed to the specification at page 28, lines 8-9 which teaches avoid interconnections between channels but does not mention

INT. SUM OK
AM 5-26-05